



Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act

**Annual Report
March 2009**

**California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
Corrections Standards Authority**

Juvenile Justice

Crime Prevention Act

Annual Report to the Legislature

March 2009

**Corrections Standards Authority
600 Bercut Drive
Sacramento, CA 95811
http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Divisions_Boards/CSA/index.html**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, *Governor*

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION
Matthew L. Cate, *Secretary*

CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY

Members

Matthew L. Cate, *Chair*

Scott Kernan

*Manager/Administrator,
State Correctional Facility for Adult Offenders*

John Ingrassia

*Administrator
Local Detention Facility
San Diego County Sheriff's Department*

Bernard Warner

*Manager/Administrator,
State Correctional Facility for Juvenile Offenders*

Mimi H. Silbert, Ph.D.

*Administrator
Local Community-Based Correctional Program
Delancey Street Foundation, San Francisco*

Ed Prieto

*Sheriff (county with rated jail capacity below 200
beds)
County of Yolo*

Vacant

*Sheriff (county with a rated jail capacity over 200
beds)*

Benjamin Curry

*Subordinate Officer of the Secretary of the
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Carol Biondi

Public Member

Vacant

County Supervisor

Eleanor Andrade-Silva

*Subordinate Officer of the Secretary of the
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Linda Penner

*Chief Probation Officer
(county over 200,000 pop.)
County of Fresno*

Collene Campbell

*Public Member
Represents Interests of Crime Victims*

Adele Arnold

*Chief Probation Officer
(county under 200,000 pop.)*

Vacant

*Representative
Community-Based Youth Service Organization*

Cleotha Adams

*Rank and File Representative
Deputy Sheriff*

Vacant

*Rank and File Representative
Juvenile Probation Officer*

Steven Marshall

*Rank and File Representative
State Parole Officer*

Travis Townsy

*Rank and File Representative
State Adult Correctional Facility*

Staff

Kurt O. Wilson, *Executive Director (A)*

CORRECTIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMS DIVISION
Marlon Yarber, *Deputy Director*

STANDARDS AND TRAINING FOR CORRECTIONS DIVISION
Debbie Rives, *Deputy Director*

FACILITIES STANDARDS AND OPERATIONS DIVISION
Gary Wion, *Deputy Director*

COUNTY FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION DIVISION
Robert J. Takeshta, *Deputy Director*

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
An Overview of the Program	2-4
■ Local Planning Process	
■ Program Evaluation	
■ Program Administration	
Statewide Evaluation	5-6
■ Program Expenditures	
■ Mandated Outcomes	
■ Local Outcomes	
County Program Highlights	7-11
Appendices	
A. Statewide Allocation and Expenditure Summary	
B. Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs	
C. Change in County Arrest Rate	

Executive Summary

The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) is a state funded initiative that supports juvenile probation programs with a record of reducing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth and young offenders. In fiscal year (FY) 2007-08 the JJCPA supported 174 programs implemented by counties to address locally identified needs throughout the continuum of responses to juvenile crime. This produced significant improvements in several measures of crime and delinquency for program participants.

The Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) is responsible for administering the JJCPA and submitting annual reports to the Legislature on: 1) the local planning process; 2) program expenditures; and 3) six mandated juvenile justice outcomes (Government Code Section 30061[4]). This seventh annual report addresses each of these issues.

Local Planning Process: The JJCPA requires counties to establish and maintain a multi-agency Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) for the purpose of developing, reviewing, and updating a comprehensive plan that documents the condition of the local juvenile justice system and outlines proposed efforts to fill identified service gaps. Chief probation officers and other JJCC members report a great deal of satisfaction with the enhanced communication, coordination, and collaboration resulting from this planning process.

Program Expenditures: By June 30, 2008, the 56 counties participating in the JJCPA program expended or encumbered 99.8 percent of the \$118,736,112 allocated in FY 2007-08 (see Appendix A: Statewide Allocation and Expenditure Summary). Counties also spent \$3,868,700 in interest earned on State funds and \$15,553,465 in non-JJCPA funds to support program activities, for a combined total of \$19,422,165. Although the JJCPA program does not have a local match requirement, the voluntary infusion of local resources demonstrates the counties' commitment to the goals of the JJCPA and significantly leverages the State's investment in deterring youth from criminal activity. A total of 103,118 minors participated in the 174 JJCPA programs in 2007-08, which translates into an average per capita cost to the State of \$1,148.66 (see Appendix B: Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs).

Juvenile Justice Outcomes: The data submitted by counties for FY 2007-08 indicate that the JJCPA programs continue to have a positive impact on juvenile crime and delinquency in communities throughout California. This is evident in the results for the mandated juvenile justice outcomes as well as education outcomes tracked by a number of counties. For example:

- Youth participating in JJCPA programs were arrested for new offenses and incarcerated at significantly lower rates than youth in a comparable reference group.
- JJCPA participants also successfully completed probation and court-ordered community service at significantly higher rates than youth in the comparison group.
- JJCPA youth attended a statistically significant greater percentage of school days, achieved statistically significant higher grade point averages, and exhibited a statistically significant likelihood of not being suspended from school than reference group youth.

In total, these results are highly consistent with those achieved in previous years, and provide ongoing evidence that the programs are continuing to have a positive effect on the juveniles they serve. Further, because the efforts supported by the JJCPA are collaborative and build upon strategies that have proven successful in the past, CSA staff believes this initiative will continue making a positive impact on public safety well into the future.

An Overview of the Program

The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) program was created by the Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (Chapter 353) to provide a stable funding source for local juvenile justice programs aimed at curbing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth.

The JJCPA involves a partnership between the state of California, 56¹ counties, and community-based organizations to enhance public safety by reducing juvenile crime and delinquency. Local officials and stakeholders determine where to direct resources through an interagency planning process; the State appropriates funds, which the Controller's Office distributes to counties on a per capita basis; and community-based organizations play a critical role in delivering services. It is a partnership that recognizes the need for juvenile justice resources and the value of local discretion and multi-agency collaboration in addressing the problem of juvenile crime in our communities.

Local Planning Process

State policies have increasingly recognized the need to strengthen the local juvenile justice system and its array of alternatives and graduated sanctions for juvenile offenders through a comprehensive local planning process that requires probation departments to coordinate their activities with other key stakeholders.

The programs funded by the JJCPA address a continuum of responses to at-risk youth and juvenile offenders—prevention, intervention, supervision, treatment, and incarceration—and respond to specific problems associated with these populations in each county.

To receive the initial JJCPA allocation, each county developed a comprehensive multi-agency juvenile justice plan that included an assessment of existing resources targeting at-risk youth, juvenile offenders and their families as well as a local action strategy for addressing identified gaps in the continuum of responses to juvenile crime and delinquency. Each year counties either update or modify their plan, as needed, or reapply for continuation funding for the same programs as the prior year. The application and any plan modifications must be approved by the CSA before funds can be expended.²

In an effort to ensure coordination and collaboration among the various local agencies serving at-risk youth and young offenders, the JJCPA required Juvenile Justice Coordinating Councils (JJCCs) chaired by the county's chief probation officer and comprised of representatives of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, the board of supervisors, social services, education, mental health and community-based organizations to develop and modify the plan. The JJCCs typically meet monthly or quarterly to review program progress and evaluation data.

Chief probation officers and other JJCC members continue to report high levels of satisfaction with the JJCPA planning process, noting that it maximizes their ability to implement or expand successful programs tailored to the specific populations and needs of local jurisdictions. In addition to pointing out that juvenile justice planning has become more strategic, integrated, and outcome-oriented, JJCC members have underscored the value of sharing information regarding youth programs across the many disciplines involved in the JJCPA programs.

¹ Alpine and Sierra Counties chose not to participate in this program due to the small amount of their expected allocations. Allocations are based, in part, on county population.

² Prior to the July 2005 reorganization of the Youth and Adult Correctional Agency, the CSA was known as the Board of Corrections.

Program Funding

Funding for the JJCPA has changed significantly in recent years. In previous years, counties received their JJCPA allocation in October for program expenditures occurring the following FY (i.e., nine months in advance). Thus, counties were able to bank and earn interest on the allocation, with the earned interest used for program expenditures in the subsequent FY. In FY 2005-06, as part of its budget reduction strategy, the Legislature changed this process so that counties would receive their allocation immediately prior to the period in which the funds were to be spent. The elimination of the nine month lead time allowed the State, rather than counties, to benefit from any interest earned on the funds.

In addition to the change in the funding cycle, the Department of Finance is required to annually adjust allocations to reflect changes in county populations. Consequently, while counties are statutorily required to apply for continuation funding by May 1 of each year, they are unaware, at that time, of the exact amount of their pending allocation. Therefore, CSA requires the counties to submit supplemental applications each year in order to capture the budget variances.

Program Evaluation

The JJCPA requires funded programs to be modeled on evidence-based strategies that have proven effective in curbing juvenile delinquency. Additionally, the JJCPA requires counties to collect and report information related to annual program expenditures and juvenile justice outcomes. At the local level, these evaluation activities enable stakeholders to assess progress toward desired goals, refine their programs, and target available resources. These evaluation efforts also enable the Legislature to monitor the State's investment in the JJCPA and assess its overall impact on juvenile crime and delinquency.

The data that counties are statutorily required to report are categorized into six categories:

- Arrest rate.
- Incarceration rate.
- Probation violation rate.
- Probation completion rate.
- Restitution completion rate.
- Community service completion rate.

Individual counties only report on outcome measures applicable to their programs. For example, a truancy prevention program serving primarily middle-school students would not be expected to have an impact on the completion of probation rate. In this example, the program would only report data for relevant categories.

In addition to the mandated outcomes, many counties track and report on local outcomes specific to their individual programs. For example, some local outcomes relate to education and track academic progress through school attendance, grade point averages, and school behavior reports.

The Legislature tasked the CSA with the administration of the JJCPA including annual legislative reports to address:

- the overall effectiveness of the local planning process;
- program expenditures for each county;
- the data for the six statutorily mandated outcome measures.

In administering the JJCPA, CSA staff work closely with the local JJCCs in developing and updating their comprehensive juvenile justice plan. This plan must be approved by the CSA each year before JJCPA funds may be expended. At the request of counties, CSA provides extensive technical assistance to identify and document programmatic strategies that have proven effective in reducing juvenile crime, determining appropriate evaluation designs for the proposed programs, and problem-solving on issues related to program implementation and evaluation.

During the 2007-08 program year, CSA staff conducted numerous technical assistance site visits, reviewed program activities and evaluation results to ensure compliance, and provided program recommendations to improve the delivery of effective programs.

Statewide Evaluation

Program Expenditures

The counties participating in the JJCPA program expended 99.8 percent of the \$118,736,112 allocated in FY 2007-08 (see Appendix A: Statewide Allocation and Expenditure Summary). Counties also spent \$3,868,700 in interest earned on State funds and \$15,553,465 in non-JJCPA funds to support program activities for a combined total of \$19,422,165. Although the JJCPA program does not have a local match requirement, the voluntary infusion of local resources demonstrates the counties' commitment to the goals of the JJCPA and significantly leverages the State's investment in deterring youth from criminal activity. A total of 103,118 minors participated in the 174 JJCPA programs in 2007-08, which translates into an average per capita cost to the State (JJCPA funds) of \$1,148.66 (see Appendix B: Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs). The current year per capita costs are less than the first year of the initiative (\$1,201.53), and have remained relatively steady during the life of the JJCPA program.

Juvenile Justice Outcomes

As required by law, the statewide evaluation of the JJCPA focuses on six legislatively mandated outcomes: arrest rates, incarceration rates, probation violation rates; and probation, restitution, and community service completion rates. The data collected by counties on these six variables clearly indicate that the JJCPA programs continue to have the intended effect of curbing juvenile crime and delinquency in California.³

Outcome results reported by counties for FY 2007-08 on juveniles who completed the full evaluation period indicate statistically significant differences in the desired direction in four of the six mandated outcomes. These results are summarized in Table A.

TABLE A
Statistically Significant Results on Juvenile Justice Outcomes (0.05 level)

Outcome Measure	Number of Programs with Available Results	Average	
		Program Juveniles	Reference Group
Arrest Rate	131	25.8%	31.4%
Incarceration Rate	136	21.1%	26.5%
Completion of Probation	109	25.8%	21.1%
Completion of Community Service	68	45.3%	39.1%

³For most outcomes, counties assess their progress by comparing the results for participating minors and a reference group (i.e., participants prior to entering the program, prior program participants, juveniles comparable to those who received program services, or some other external reference group). The length and timing of the evaluation periods vary from program to program. For example, one program might compare the arrest rate of participants for the three-month period prior to program entry with their arrest rate during the first three months of the program, whereas another program might use a longer time period and compare the arrest rate prior to program entry with the arrest rate following program exit.

While the results for the rate of completion of restitution was slightly higher for the program participants than the control group (28.7 percent vs. 27.7 percent for the 71 programs who had available results) this is not statistically significant. These results are comparable to the previous two years.

Overall results for the remaining mandated outcome, probation violation rate, were also consistent with findings in previous years in that the average rates were approximately the same for the two groups in the 100 programs for which results were available (28.4 percent for the program juveniles; 29.4 percent for the reference group juveniles). As mentioned in previous reports, these findings are not surprising given that many of the programs involve increased levels of supervision, thus increasing the likelihood of detecting probation violations when they occur. Further, when restricted to only those programs where the expectation was that there would be fewer probation violations by program juveniles (52 programs); there was a somewhat lower probation violation rate among program juveniles (27.6 percent) than reference group juveniles (30.4 percent). The difference, however, was not statistically significant.

The enabling legislation also requires that all counties specify a goal or expectation for change in the annual countywide arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles age 10 to 17. Each county also specifies data from a baseline year to which comparisons are made. In most cases, the baseline for this reporting period is 2006. Results for this measure are presented for the most recent reporting year (2007) in Appendix C.

A total of 24 counties expected the arrest rate to be reduced; 24 counties expected no change; and eight counties expected the rate to go up. As predicted, 24 counties reported an arrest rate reduction (42.9 percent); however, there was no link between the predictions and outcomes of specific counties. The rate declined in ten (41.7 percent) of the counties that expected a decline, ten (41.7 percent) of the counties that expected no change, and four (50 percent) of the counties that expected an increase. Overall, the juvenile arrest rate decreased from 5,168 in 2006 to 5,087 in 2007 for the 56 counties that participated in the JJCPA, marking a return to the year-to-year declines that have occurred in the overall arrest rate in all but one year (2006) since the inception of JJCPA.

Education Outcomes

In addition to the mandated outcomes, the JJCPA programs report on many local outcomes. Some of these are common to a sufficient number of programs to permit the aggregation of findings. The most widely reported local outcomes pertain to conduct and achievement in school. As shown in Table B, the results for these outcomes are quite impressive. Program juveniles, on average, attended a significantly greater percentage of school days, achieved significantly higher grade point averages, and were significantly less likely to be suspended from school than reference group juveniles. Again, these results are highly consistent with results obtained in previous years.

TABLE B
Summary of Local Results on Education Outcomes

Outcome Measure	Number of Programs Reporting Results	Average	
		Program Juveniles	Reference Group
% School Days Attended	15	85.6%	75.0%
% Suspended from School	11	19.0%	27.7%
Grade Point Average	17	2.03	1.73

County Program Highlights

During FY 2007-08 there were 174 programs in the 56 participating counties. The JJCPA recognizes the importance of a continuum of responses to the complex problem of juvenile crime and delinquency—from prevention, intervention, and supervision to treatment and incapacitation or commitment to a local juvenile facility. The local planning and decision-making process inherent in JJCPA resulted in the implementation, improvement and/or expansion of a variety of juvenile justice efforts, as evidenced by the following examples.

Prevention/Early Intervention/Supervision

The following programs, typically referred to as prevention/early intervention and supervision programs, focus on keeping at-risk youth from entering the juvenile justice system and preventing first-time offenders from further involvement in the juvenile justice system. These programs may also provide very intensive supervision for probation youth in the community.

Santa Cruz County operates a very successful Community Accountability Program (CAP). The probation department provides geographically-based probation services for pre-adjudicated youth and youth on probation in need of intensive services. The CAP served 201 probation wards during the program year. Additionally, the program served 81 youth who were diverted from the formal juvenile justice system. Youth receive a service plan based on risk. Services include an after school curriculum, participation in community service activities, and employment preparations.

The CAP is a year long program. Data is tracked for the participants over a 365-day period that begins on the day each probationer begins receiving services by the probation officer in the CAP. Of the 201 probation youth served, 154 youth completed the program (76.6 percent). The completed program measure is defined locally as youth who have completed probation. Additionally, the 81 diverted youth successfully completed the program and were diverted from formal probation.

Arrest rates for CAP youth have consistently stayed below the comparison group (.74 vs. .95 mean arrest rate based on county-reported outcome measures). This can partly be attributed to Santa Cruz County's involvement in the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives initiative. The probation department is a model site for reducing the use of secure detention without jeopardizing community safety. Santa Cruz has significantly reduced the use of confinement for low- and medium-risk youth through the use of a risk assessment instrument at booking to determine if a youth will be held, released, or released with certain conditions. The instrument helps ensure that only those youth who need to be held because of risk to re-offend, risk to victims and/or a risk of failing to appear for court are detained. When this instrument is used in combination with appropriate detention alternatives, only those youth that pose a high risk to themselves and others are detained.

Santa Cruz County uses two separate programs for minors diverted from the formal juvenile justice system. The first diversion program, Teen Peer Court, is operated by the County Office of Education. The Teen Peer Court is a program run by teens for teens. Teen offenders, between the ages of 13 and 17, who have an adjudicated misdemeanor petition, have their cases heard by a jury of their peers. The teens perform the roles of prosecuting and defense attorneys, bailiff, clerk and jury. A local volunteer judge or attorney presides as judge and is the only adult directly involved in the court proceedings. After carefully listening to the facts, the teen jury deliberates the case and decides a constructive sentence for the offender. If the offender does not complete their sentence or rejects the teen jury sentence, then the case is returned to the probation officer for further handling.

The program coordinator promotes the cooperation and coordination of school and local agencies to: increase access to services, expand early intervention, enhance community awareness, and empower at-risk youth and families. The coordinator works closely with the program sites to receive appropriate referrals from the service areas to the Teen Peer Court.

The second diversion program in Santa Cruz County is the Victim Offender Dialogue Program (VODP) which is operated by the Conflict Resolution Center. The program brings together juvenile offenders and victims of the juvenile's actions, who are willing to dialogue with one another in a safe environment—in the presence of two trained mediators (one staff person and one volunteer). The VODP is victim-sensitive, allowing victims a place in the justice system, while offering offenders a diversion from the traditional court system—giving the parties an opportunity to discuss the impact the crime has had on them, holding the offender accountable for his/her actions, and allowing the victim an opportunity to express him/herself directly to the person who has caused them harm. This program allows both the victim and offender to have input as to what the restitution agreement will be to repair the harm. Restitution is typically the outcome of the dialogue process, though it is secondary to bringing the victim and offender together to have an authentic dialogue. The mediators meet with the victim and offender individually and in person prior to the dialogue session between victim and offender to help prepare the parties for a successful dialogue session.

Riverside County has used JJCPA funds to develop youth accountability teams (YAT). The YAT program funds 19 multi-agency early intervention and prevention service teams on 108 middle school and high school campuses. The YAT are each comprised of a deputy probation officer, a law enforcement officer, a paralegal, and an outreach counselor. For the 2007-08 program year, YAT teams served over 2,000 at-risk youth and their families in 21 school districts throughout Riverside County.

The YAT program receives referrals from a variety of sources including school districts, law enforcement, or the parents and peers of at-risk youth. Minors are usually referred following some delinquent or pre-delinquent behavior including truancy, inappropriate school conduct, incidents of aggression, theft, family issues, and incorrigibility.

In FY 2007-08, program teams processed 3,563 referrals. There were 2,040 minors supervised on informal contracts. The remaining cases were placed on consequence agreements, counseled and closed, or referred to other resources for appropriate services. The YAT program provides a variety of services to local school districts including: participating in school attendance review boards, conducting truancy sweeps, providing on-site supervision during school hours, and implementing and conducting summer programs. Additionally, the YAT program has prepared and facilitated presentations for program youth on topics such as: life skills, bullying, gang prevention, parenting classes, etc.

Of the 2,040 minors supervised by the YAT program in FY 2007-08, the rate of successful completion was 39.2 percent (800 minors). Additionally, 948 minors (46.5 percent) were still involved in the program and were completing their contracts in good standing. The numbers of minors completing the program or active at year end was 1,746 (85.7 percent). Of the 292 (14.3 percent) minors who failed their contracts, 111 were delinquent offenders and 181 were status offenders. The YAT program reports that only 18 delinquency petitions were filed (five felonies, 13 misdemeanors). Since the inception of JJCPA funding, approximately 80 percent of the youth who successfully completed the YAT program have experienced no subsequent court filing.

The YAT program began in the year 2000 with the inception of JJCPA funding. The juvenile arrest rate in Riverside County in the year 2000 was 4,517. Riverside County has noted a continuous decline in the juvenile arrest rate with the 2007 rate being only 3,892 for a reduction of 625 (13.8 percent).

Kern County's Repeat Offender Prevention Program (ROPP) provides intervention and supervision services to delinquent minors at risk for continued involvement in the juvenile justice system. ROPP is a collaborative effort that involves the probation, mental health, human services, and public health departments in addition to local schools, and other public entities. In addition to providing direct services to probation youth, the program also provides a variety of prevention and referral services to the siblings and families of the at-risk youth.

ROPP is an intensive supervision program. In order to be referred to the program, minors must meet at least three of the four qualifying criteria:

- Significant family problems.
- School attendance and behavioral problems.
- Drug and/or alcohol use by the minor.
- High risk delinquent behavior such as gang involvement, runaway pattern and/or theft related crimes.

Each ROPP probation officer is assigned only 20-25 cases. Small caseload numbers are imperative to the overall function and delivery of services to those minors and their families involved in the program. The small caseload numbers allow ROPP officers the opportunity for daily ongoing contact and involvement with the program youth. ROPP officers work closely with local law enforcement, and ROPP officers are frequently involved in coordinated gang sweeps, probation searches, and other intensive supervision operations.

The goal of ROPP is to improve family functioning and reduce the incidents and impact of delinquency by providing comprehensive services through a multi-agency collaborative effort. Substance abuse specialists are contracted to provide counseling and educational services to the program youth. Additionally, ROPP officers are expected to develop weekly social skills groups to provide minors with a venue to discuss issues dealing with peers, decision making, sexually transmitted diseases, substance abuse, and related topics. Officers may also involve other agencies to provide necessary information through presentations, field trips, or guest speakers.

An integral component of ROPP is the opportunity for youth to participate in personal enrichment activities. Organizations are solicited for donations of event tickets, both locally and out-of-county, in order to expose minors to new activities that they may not otherwise have the opportunity to experience. Program youth participate in picnics, horse shoe tournaments, ping pong games, and various activities with ROPP officers. This interaction with the ROPP staff promotes mentoring and provides the youth with examples of positive role modeling. Special events are used as incentives and rewards for good behavior. In the past, these events have included: Harlem Globetrotters, Bakersfield College football, Los Angeles Dodgers baseball, the Museum of Human Tolerance, and the Santa Barbara Zoo.

ROPP minors are involved in a variety of civic pride and community service activities. The ROPP program collaborates with both public and private agencies to provide a variety of community service opportunities for program youth. ROPP minors have been involved in graffiti abatement programs, community clean-up events, tree plantings, etc.

Youth can be involved in ROPP for 18-24 months. For the 2007-08 program years, 273 youth participated in the program; 22 completed the program and 195 were still in progress at year end. Despite the intense nature of the ROPP, only 56 minors (or approximately 20 percent) failed to complete the program.

The ROPP graduation is held in the juvenile court. Minors are publicly recognized for their accomplishments over the past 18 to 24 months. Following the graduation ceremony, the minors' formal probation is terminated. Ceremonial aspects of the graduation include courtroom attendance by the minors and their families as well as speeches by the presiding judge, chief probation officer, and other dignitaries. Minors receive special awards from local service organizations for outstanding performances while on probation.

Glenn County's Personal Pathways Program (PPP) provides pre-employment training and job placement services to Glenn County juvenile probationers between 14 and 17 years of age. Academic stability is a prerequisite of program participation and collaboration with community, public, and private entities is key to the success of the PPP. JJCPA funds have been used to expand the participant base of informal and formal probation wards in the Glenn County Human Resource Agency-sponsored Youth Employment Services (YES) collaborative, which offers "job readiness" sessions and employment training opportunities. To accomplish this goal, the program involves the following: an additional transportation system for probation department-sponsored youth who are not served by public transportation services; supplying clothing and tools as needed; paying the wages of sponsored youth during job training placement; and developing additional employment opportunities. Additionally, funds are used to pay tuition costs for certificated trades such as welding, laboratory technician, dental assistant, etc., through classes at Butte-Glenn Community College, the Glenn County Office of Education Regional Opportunity Program, and other educational entities.

The PPP is designed to address the gaps in the continuum of services provided by county youth-serving agencies and community-based organizations. The approach is designed to prevent juvenile crime by providing youth with an opportunity to achieve stable employment as a viable option to delinquent activity. Program participants are identified primarily through the school systems and probation services. The identified youth are referred to PPP, which serves as the primary case manager for participants engaged in the program. The probation department has become the referring agency under the Glenn County Human Resource Agency's Youth Employment Services collaborative to develop employment training services for program participants. In accordance with YES procedures, youth are engaged in job readiness classes leading to eventual job training placement and employment. Upon successful completion of the YES nine-week training session, PPP youth are paid minimum wage (\$8.00 per hour) for 180 hours, working approximately 15 hours per week for three months of job training placement.

Generally, participants in PPP reduce their already low rates of unexcused school absences and decrease the number of incarcerations during the post-program period of monitoring. During FY 2007-08, 40 percent of students completed their community service assignments and approximately 33 percent completed their probation.

EL Dorado County's Community Alliance to Reduce Truancy (CART) program places deputy probation officers on school campuses to provide intensive supervision and monitoring to approximately twenty juvenile probationers at the school locations, and enables them to immediately address problem behaviors and truancy by probationers. The officers maintain a high-profile presence on the school campus and during school events to create a safer school environment by deterring problem behaviors, delinquent activity, and violence. The deputy

probation officers work collaboratively with school personnel, law enforcement, and community agencies to provide prevention, intervention and outreach assistance to “at-risk” students, the entire student body, and their families. Additional program activities include sharing information and intelligence with law enforcement, addressing and preventing gang activity, participating in safety planning, and assisting the schools in responding to problems and critical incidents.

The CART program represents the other end of the spectrum on the juvenile justice continuum. It has reported a slight increase in the number of program minors arrested in relation to the prior year (18.4 percent compared to 16.5 percent in the previous year). Additionally, CART minors incarceration rate increased by 4.7 percent during the 2007-08 program year. However, changes in the local juvenile justice environment help to explain the increase. The increase in incarceration rate is a reflection of the ability for local law enforcement, the probation department, and the court to detain a minor for lower-level delinquent acts. Prior to the construction of a new juvenile detention center in South Lake Tahoe in September 2004, the probation department only operated one juvenile detention facility (Placerville Juvenile Hall). The juvenile hall operates under a court-ordered population cap of 40 minors. The facility was often overcrowded, limiting the ability of local law enforcement, the probation department, or the court to use detention as an option for a juvenile offender for lower-level offenses or probation violations. Since the opening of the South Lake Tahoe Juvenile Treatment Center, the populations of both juvenile detention facilities in the county have been below their court-mandated capacities. Over the last several years the probation department has educated local law enforcement, the court, and probation department employees that they no longer run at capacity in the detention facilities and immediate detention is an option for low level offenses and violations of probation. This has resulted in local law enforcement increasing bookings for juveniles with lower level offenses. The probation department has increased bookings for juveniles violating their probation conditions, and has given the Court increased ability to remand and commit juvenile offenders to the juvenile hall or the South Lake Tahoe Juvenile Treatment Center to complete special programs offered in those facilities.

APPENDIX A: Statewide Allocation and Expenditure Summary ⁴

County	State Fund Expenditures	Interest Expenditures	Non-JCPA Fund Expenditures	Total Expenditures	Allocated Funds
Alameda	\$4,814,154	\$20,000	\$800,000	\$5,634,154	\$4,814,154
Amador	\$121,318	\$1,693	\$18,203	\$141,214	\$121,318
Butte	\$687,427	\$11,563	\$285,316	\$984,306	\$687,833
Calaveras	\$145,096	\$6,064	\$0	\$151,160	\$145,096
Colusa	\$69,197	\$3,459	\$0	\$72,656	\$69,197
Contra Costa	\$3,285,812	\$59,851	\$1,178,119	\$4,523,782	\$3,285,812
Del Norte	\$92,493	\$0	\$59,347	\$151,840	\$92,493
El Dorado	\$563,241	\$17,928	\$78,185	\$659,354	\$563,241
Fresno	\$2,887,486	\$130,008	\$0	\$3,017,494	\$2,887,486
Glenn	\$91,150	\$2,211	\$0	\$93,361	\$91,150
Humboldt	\$416,036	\$2,371	\$880,705	\$1,299,112	\$416,036
Imperial	\$544,321	\$6,337	\$0	\$550,658	\$544,321
Inyo	\$57,949	\$0	\$0	\$57,949	\$57,949
Kern	\$2,518,013	\$96,409	\$66,625	\$2,681,047	\$2,518,013
Kings	\$450,475	\$21,857	\$0	\$472,332	\$477,204
Lake	\$202,620	\$4,746	\$28,713	\$236,079	\$202,620
Lassen	\$103,199	\$0	\$0	\$103,199	\$116,531
Los Angeles	\$32,608,249	\$1,613,794	\$0	\$34,222,043	\$32,608,251
Madera	\$468,819	\$21,413	\$0	\$490,232	\$468,819
Marin	\$806,942	\$0	\$0	\$806,942	\$806,942
Mariposa	\$58,152	\$0	\$3,258	\$61,410	\$58,152
Mendocino	\$284,628	\$9,571	\$0	\$294,199	\$284,628
Merced	\$792,845	\$0	\$0	\$792,845	\$792,845
Modoc	\$26,597	\$200	\$10,000	\$36,797	\$30,644
Mono	\$44,085	\$617	\$0	\$44,702	\$44,085
Monterey	\$1,342,770	\$14,148	\$1,403,977	\$2,760,895	\$1,342,770
Napa	\$428,620	\$10,389	\$0	\$439,009	\$428,620
Nevada	\$317,191	\$10,542	\$0	\$327,733	\$317,191
Orange	\$9,766,326	\$341,846	\$709,628	\$10,817,800	\$9,766,326
Placer	\$1,019,036	\$21,529	\$0	\$1,040,565	\$1,019,036
Plumas	\$62,491	\$0	\$69,738	\$132,229	\$66,603
Riverside	\$6,237,739	\$166,630	\$97,666	\$6,502,035	\$6,404,369
Sacramento	\$4,434,722	\$130,744	\$1,043,961	\$5,609,427	\$4,434,722
San Benito	\$177,073	\$6,967	\$0	\$184,040	\$182,215
San Bernardino	\$6,392,983	\$130,166	\$283,060	\$6,806,209	\$6,392,803
San Diego	\$9,773,900	\$250,000	\$5,879,925	\$15,903,825	\$9,773,900
San Francisco	\$2,549,748	\$90,679	\$0	\$2,640,427	\$2,549,748
San Joaquin	\$2,142,603	\$0	\$0	\$2,142,603	\$2,142,603
San Luis Obispo	\$835,054	\$37,559	\$109,002	\$981,615	\$835,054
San Mateo	\$2,312,228	\$78,316	\$941,706	\$3,332,250	\$2,312,228
Santa Barbara	\$1,337,931	\$12,133	\$962,742	\$2,312,806	\$1,337,931
Santa Clara	\$5,699,604	\$229,067	\$0	\$5,928,671	\$5,699,604
Santa Cruz	\$832,610	\$28,572	\$0	\$861,182	\$832,610
Shasta	\$571,837	\$19,600	\$51,384	\$642,821	\$571,837
Siskiyou	\$144,135	\$7,885	\$11,183	\$163,203	\$144,859
Solano	\$1,339,186	\$50,536	\$0	\$1,389,722	\$1,339,186
Sonoma	\$1,522,224	\$46,323	\$0	\$1,568,547	\$1,522,224
Stanislaus	\$1,638,372	\$18,035	\$0	\$1,656,407	\$1,638,372
Sutter	\$295,069	\$9,431	\$98,709	\$403,209	\$295,069
Tehama	\$174,897	\$0	\$0	\$174,897	\$194,733
Trinity	\$44,672	\$1,600	\$0	\$46,272	\$44,672
Tulare	\$1,352,372	\$39,991	\$0	\$1,392,363	\$1,352,372
Tuolumne	\$181,786	\$1,859	\$545	\$184,190	\$181,786
Ventura	\$2,602,294	\$55,309	\$481,768	\$3,139,371	\$2,602,294
Yolo	\$564,107	\$28,752	\$0	\$592,859	\$611,500
Yuba	<u>\$214,085</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$214,085</u>	<u>\$214,085</u>
TOTALS	\$118,447,969	\$3,868,700	\$15,553,465	\$137,870,134	\$118,736,142

⁴ Alpine and Sierra counties did not apply for JJCPA funding. Allocation amounts of \$3,975 (Alpine County) and \$10,986 (Sierra County) would have been available.

APPENDIX B: Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs

County	Programs	Program Participants	Average Per Capita Costs	
			JJCPA Funds	All Funds
Alameda	1	1,500	\$3,209.44	\$3,756.10
Amador	1	94	\$1,290.62	\$1,502.28
Butte	4	801	\$858.21	\$1,228.85
Calaveras	2	72	\$2,015.22	\$2,099.44
Colusa	1	121	\$571.88	\$600.46
Contra Costa	4	1,611	\$2,039.61	\$2,808.06
Del Norte	1	73	\$1,267.03	\$2,080.00
El Dorado	1	456	\$1,235.18	\$1,445.95
Fresno	1	790	\$3,655.05	\$3,819.61
Glenn	1	30	\$3,038.33	\$3,112.03
Humboldt	2	417	\$997.69	\$3,115.38
Imperial	3	2,361	\$230.55	\$233.23
Inyo	2	597	\$97.07	\$97.07
Kern	2	536	\$4,697.79	\$5,001.95
Kings	1	327	\$1,377.60	\$1,444.44
Lake	1	105	\$1,929.71	\$2,248.37
Lassen	3	913	\$113.03	\$113.03
Los Angeles	14	25,866	\$1,260.66	\$1,323.05
Madera	1	160	\$2,930.12	\$3,063.95
Marin	3	301	\$2,680.87	\$2,680.87
Mariposa	1	181	\$321.28	\$339.28
Mendocino	2	335	\$849.64	\$878.21
Merced	1	125	\$6,342.76	\$6,342.76
Modoc	1	19	\$1,399.84	\$1,936.68
Mono	1	25	\$1,763.40	\$1,788.08
Monterey	8	6,394	\$210.00	\$431.79
Napa	2	198	\$2,164.75	\$2,217.22
Nevada	3	253	\$1,253.72	\$1,295.39
Orange	10	3,351	\$2,914.45	\$3,228.23
Placer	3	1,307	\$779.68	\$796.15
Plumas	1	140	\$446.36	\$944.49
Riverside	2	2,173	\$2,870.57	\$2,992.19
Sacramento	4	1,352	\$3,280.12	\$4,148.98
San Benito	1	47	\$3,767.51	\$3,915.74
San Bernardino	5	13,657	\$468.11	\$498.37
San Diego	4	6,927	\$1,410.99	\$2,295.92
San Francisco	6	1,412	\$1,805.77	\$1,869.99
San Joaquin	3	1,774	\$1,207.78	\$1,207.78
San Luis Obispo	2	785	\$1,063.76	\$1,250.46
San Mateo	9	2,000	\$1,131.51	\$1,641.52
Santa Barbara	3	3,676	\$363.96	\$629.16
Santa Clara	6	10,917	\$522.09	\$543.07
Santa Cruz	2	389	\$2,140.39	\$2,213.84
Shasta	5	743	\$769.63	\$865.17
Siskiyou	1	238	\$605.61	\$685.73
Solano	4	1,319	\$1,015.30	\$1,053.62
Sonoma	9	868	\$1,753.71	\$1,807.08
Stanislaus	3	993	\$1,649.92	\$1,668.08
Sutter	4	123	\$2,398.93	\$3,278.12
Tehama	1	47	\$3,721.21	\$3,721.21
Trinity	1	30	\$1,489.07	\$1,542.40
Tulare	3	1,260	\$1,073.31	\$1,105.05
Tuolumne	2	101	\$1,799.86	\$1,823.66
Ventura	7	2,630	\$989.47	\$1,193.68
Yolo	3	103	\$5,476.77	\$5,755.91
Yuba	2	95	\$2,253.53	\$2,253.53
TOTALS	174	103,118	\$1,148.66	\$1,337.01

APPENDIX C: Change in County Arrest Rates per 100,000 Juveniles Age 10-17

County	Baseline Rate	Baseline Year	Expectation	Current Rate (2007)	Change	Meet/Exceed Expectations
Alameda	4,962	2000	Decrease	4,137	-825	Yes
Amador	3,960	2006	No Change	3,441	-519	Yes
Butte	6,390	2006	Increase	6,618	228	Yes
Calaveras	5,796	2006	Decrease	6,085	289	No
Colusa	3,361	2006	Increase	3,972	611	Yes
Contra Costa	3,221	2006	Decrease	3,476	255	No
Del Norte	4,005	2006	No Change	4,944	939	No
El Dorado	3,641	2006	Decrease	3,636	-5	Yes
Fresno	6,326	2006	Decrease	6,334	8	No
Glenn	15,629	2006	Decrease	9,448	-6,181	Yes
Humboldt	7,154	2006	Decrease	8,419	1,265	No
Imperial	3,384	2006	Increase	4,177	793	Yes
Inyo	2,749	2006	No Change	3,686	937	No
Kern	5,799	2006	No Change	5,382	-417	Yes
Kings	14,607	2006	No Change	11,923	-2,684	Yes
Lake	7,063	2006	No Change	8,723	1,660	No
Lassen	4,370	2006	Decrease	4,609	239	No
Los Angeles	4,724	2006	Decrease	4,567	-157	Yes
Madera	3,502	2006	Increase	3,586	84	Yes
Marin	7,193	2006	Decrease	7,918	725	No
Mariposa	1,761	2006	No Change	3,945	2,184	No
Mendocino	6,738	2006	Decrease	6,835	97	No
Merced	8,540	2006	No Change	8,840	300	No
Modoc	1,821	2006	Decrease	1,861	40	No
Mono	1,518	2006	No Change	1,268	-250	Yes
Monterey	5,637	2006	No Change	6,003	366	No
Napa	3,006	2006	Decrease	3,127	121	No
Nevada	6,350	2006	No Change	5,565	-785	Yes
Orange	6,646	1997	Decrease	4,118	-2,528	Yes
Placer	4,114	2006	No Change	3,866	-248	Yes
Plumas	11,667	2006	Increase	8,057	-3,610	Yes
Riverside	3,821	2006	Decrease	3,892	71	No
Sacramento	4,046	2006	No Change	3,708	-338	Yes
San Benito	5,710	2006	No Change	5,224	-486	Yes
San Bernardino	6,885	2006	No Change	6,217	-668	Yes
San Diego	5,307	2006	Decrease	4,618	-689	Yes
San Francisco	5,071	2006	No Change	5,425	354	No
San Joaquin	7,204	2006	Decrease	6,864	-340	Yes
San Luis Obispo	4,166	2006	Decrease	4,300	134	No
San Mateo	3,760	2006	No Change	3,802	42	No
Santa Barbara	8,203	2006	Increase	7,171	-1,032	Yes
Santa Clara	6,276	2006	No Change	7,071	795	No
Santa Cruz	5,793	2006	Decrease	6,926	1,133	No
Shasta	6,631	2006	No Change	6,715	84	No
Siskiyou	5,556	2006	No Change	6,415	859	No
Solano	10,420	2006	Decrease	9,896	-524	Yes
Sonoma	5,961	2006	Increase	5,958	-3	Yes
Stanislaus	5,639	2006	Decrease	5,571	-68	Yes
Sutter	6,067	2006	Increase	5,794	-273	Yes
Tehama	5,431	2006	Decrease	4,681	-750	Yes
Trinity	6,791	2006	No Change	5,031	-1,760	Yes
Tulare	6,354	2006	No Change	6,680	326	No
Tuolumne	6,000	2006	No Change	6,469	469	No
Ventura	6,952	2006	Decrease	6,959	7	No
Yolo	5,260	2006	Decrease	5,799	539	No
Yuba	<u>3,372</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>No Change</u>	<u>4,390</u>	<u>1,018</u>	<u>No</u>
All JJCPA Counties	5,168	2006		5,087	-81	

Source data for Arrest Rates: Criminal Justice Center, California Department of Justice